

**IMAC-QA SUBCOMMITTEE**  
**NOVEMBER 24, 2003**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Attendees:** Joanne Ator, Door Co.; Jackie Bennett, Racine Co.; Chris Elms, Dane Co.; John Haine, DHFS; Lisa Hanson, DHFS; Pam Lohaus, DHFS; Marilyn Rudd, DHFS; Marcia Williamson, DHFS; Kathy Judd, Dane Co.; Vickie Jessup, DHFS; Rick Zynda, DHFS

**Absent:** Jacaie Coutant, Milwaukee Co.; Bernadette Connolly, DHFS; Lorie Mueller, LaCrosse Co.

Minutes from 10/27/03 approved as written.

**Review of QA Admin memo input:**

Purpose is to add county flexibility to 2<sup>nd</sup> party reviews and the MA only reviews. Clarification of the MA only reviews from statement in memo "to review at least one Medicaid only case per month". Discussion was regarding whether this was meant to be one MA only case per county? It was stated the purpose of the memo is to get counties to start reviewing MA only cases and to get a preliminary data base of MA only 2<sup>nd</sup> party review statistics. Will a desk aid be needed for counties to do MA only reviews? Question came up as to whether a form can be put in Newman to help with the MA reviews. Lisa will check on cost to get this set up. Discussions followed regarding how counties should draw the sample case to be used for the MA only 2<sup>nd</sup> party review. Since we are looking at a minimum of 1 per county per month this should not be a burden on any county. Counties should have flexibility as to how they decide which case(s) to review.

Discussion ensued around the issue of whether the 2<sup>nd</sup> party reviewer needed to verify actual income for the month being reviewed. Some guidelines will need to be drawn up for the counties to use. One guideline that will be recommended to counties is that cases need to have a 6 month delay in reviewing so that DILHR wages for the month in question will be accessible on line to the reviewer. Vicki will be sending out a request to the committee for information that we feel should be checked on these MA only reviews. John reminded us that the purpose of the MA only 2<sup>nd</sup> party

reviews is to improve the administration and the quality of the MA program.

**Evaluation of Change Centers:** John provided copies of a draft of a Change Center Information Matrix with information from Milwaukee, Dane, Washington, Outagamie, and LaCrosse counties. Preliminary data provided comparing the change centers in Wisconsin. Milwaukee's Change Center has gone up slowly partly due to their move. Dane County's change center has been up and fully operational since March 2003. Charts were provided showing Dane's error rate at 0% for 4 of the 5 months since the centers start up. How effective is the change center is reducing errors? Summary of discussion was that longer time is needed to get accurate statistics on how effective is the change center. Also suggested looking at number of cases in error verses the dollar amount of the errors. It was also discussed whether there is a way to track whether QC discovered errors were the result of a worker error or a change center error.

How do we want to set up evaluation criteria for Change Centers? Can we get data from Milwaukee on there change Center? Lisa will contact Milwaukee County for information on how their change center is progressing. She will also contact some of the other states with change centers to see what criteria they are using to measure the effectiveness of the centers.

Sara Shackleton from the Dane County Job Center came in to meeting to discuss the progress of the Change Center in Dane County. Number of calls answered by the call center has been increasing each month, - October 2003 answered 4300 calls. Have recently added ½ more individuals to the center staff. Number of complaints to supervisors and management about not being able to reach their worker has drastically gone down. Workers are very pleased with the reduced number of calls they are receiving since the change center started up giving them more time to work on cases. Customers are being serviced faster and making less calls to report a change to their case. More effective case processing of changes resulting in fewer errors. One of the reasons for the effectiveness of the change center could be the criteria used to select staff for the center.

Joanne stated she was not sure how the change center would work in the smaller counties. She will need to see more

statistics to determine if it would work in smaller counties.

**Error Definition - APE or no:**

Discussion whether there should be a pass down to counties for sanctions. What will happen to counties in consortiums? Who will be liable for errors on changes reported to the change reporting centers? A lot will need to be worked out between counties through their contracts with the consortium counties.

No meeting in December due to holidays. Dates set for 2004 meetings and sign-up sheet passed for note takers. See attached list.

*Submitted by Chris Elms*